

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/613,178	07/03/2003		Patrick E. Bachelder	ME 7.2	4907	
7.	590	03/09/2005	EXAMINER			
Waters & Mo 400 Ledyard B			BASTIANELLI, JOHN			
125 Ottawa, Avenue, NW				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Grand Rapids, MI 49503			3751			
				DATE MAILED: 03/09/2009	ς.	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					(h				
		Application No.		Applicant(s)	61	_			
		10/613,178		BACHELDER, PATRICK E.					
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit		_			
		John Bastianelli		3751					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cove	r sheet with the co	rrespondence ad	dress				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the made patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, how reply within the statutory miniod will apply and will expire atute, cause the application t	ever, may a reply be time nimum of thirty (30) days v SIX (6) MONTHS from th o become ABANDONED	ly filed will be considered timely e mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03	3 July 2003.							
	•	his action is non-fin							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with the claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consider							
Applicat	ion Papers								
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exame The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 July 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the core The oath or declaration is objected to by the	a)⊠ accepted or b the drawing(s) be helo rection is required if th	l in abeyance. See ne drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). cted to. See 37 Cf					
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been reco ents have been reco priority documents h reau (PCT Rule 17.2	eived. eived in Applicatio ave been received 2(a)).	n No I in this National	Stage				
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date	/08) 5) <u> </u>	Interview Summary (I Paper No(s)/Mail Dat Notice of Informal Pa Other:	e	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/613,178 Page 2

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

- 1. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the flared end" is previously referenced in claim 2 and not claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.
- 2. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 6 of the claim, "the gasket" should be --a gasket-- as this is the first time it is referenced and in line 7 of the claim, "a valve seat" should be --the valve seat-- as it is referenced previously in line 4. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Allin US 2,675,021.

 Allin discloses a method for producing a valve holder assembly having a valve holder V with an enlarged flange 20 and cylindrical portion 19a and 19b, a compressible gasket 21 abutting the enlarged flange, a retaining washer 22 over the cylindrical portion and terminating a shoulder (at 19a), a portion of the cylindrical portion is flared radially outward to form a retaining cap 23 by riveting (col. 3, line 74-col. 4, line 8) on the outer side of the retaining washer (The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (applying a rotary forming tool and formed by an orbital riveter have no patentable weight). If the product in the product-by-process

Application/Control Number: 10/613,178 Page 3

Art Unit: 3751

claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 4, and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullins US 5,092,364 in view of Allin US 2,675,021.

Mullins discloses an apparatus and method for producing a valve holder assembly having interchangeable male and female coupling components (Fig. 2). Mullins lacks each valve holder assembly having a retaining washer and gasket with a cap. Allin discloses a valve holder assembly having a retaining washer holding a gasket and being held by a cap (see paragraph 5 above). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make each valve holder assembly of Mulllins with a retaining washer holding a gasket and being held by a cap as disclosed by Allin in order to provide a valve that will hold up in a high pressure environment (The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (applying a rotary forming tool and formed by an orbital riveter have no patentable weight). If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made

Art Unit: 3/31

by a different process (see MPEP 2113)). The cylindrical portion has an inwardly adjacent portion of lesser diameter that forms a shoulder.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allin US 2,675,021 in view of Medvick et al. US 4,671,540.

Allin lacks a guide with legs made out of powdered metal. Medvick discloses a guide K with legs 102 that is made out of powdered metal (col. 8, lines 34-44). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the valve stem 26 of Allin with a guide with legs as disclosed by Medvick in order to provide more precise linear movement of the valve so the valve does not get stuck.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Petrova and Shames disclose a valve with a gasket, retaining washer, and cap.

Norton and Ramacier disclose male and female interchangeable valves. Gates, Cooper, and Holcombe disclose forming to put a cap on a valve. Haining discloses a guide with legs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Bastianelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-4921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,178

Art Unit: 3751

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Bastianelli Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

February 25, 2005